

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Final Office Action of October 13, 2009 (Office Action). Claims 1, 3, and 18 have been amended.. The amendments to these claims are supported by the specification and drawings (see, for example, the sentence bridging pages 13 and 14 of the specification). Therefore, no new matter has been added.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-12, 14, and 16-22 were pending. Claims 1-12, 14, and 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. The rejections, and Applicant's response thereto, are set forth in full below.

In the remarks that follow the terms Applicant, Applicants, Applicant's, and Applicants' as used herein shall relate to all inventors associated with the present Office Action.

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview on January 7, 2009, to claim amendments. Applicant's position as articulated during the interview is set forth below.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-12, 14, and 17-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,912,564 to Appleman (hereinafter 'Appleman') in view of U.S. Patent Application published under 2002/0087646 to Hickey *et al.* (hereinafter 'Hickey') and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,684,248 to Janacek *et al.* (hereinafter 'Janacek').

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Appleman in view of Hickey, and further in view of 'Official Notice'.

For the following reasons, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

II. **Response**

The arguments presented in the previous response filed on June 24, 2009, are still apropos and are therefore incorporated herein by reference. Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, defining properties of the user IM account using the user profile, wherein a user type associated with a user is assigned, the user type being part of the group comprising an administrator, a guest, and a user having limited privileges and access. Claims 3 and 18 have been amended in a similar manner.

While the Examiner further relies on Janacek (see col. 6, line 63 through col. 7, line 8), Janacek relates to an email account where the user types are either "receive-only" or both "receive and send." In contrast, Applicant's amended independent claims recite, in the context of a user IM account, that the user type is part of the group comprising an administrator, a guest, and a user having limited privileges and access. Thus, claims 1, 3 and 18 clearly patentably distinguish over the combined teachings of Appleman, Hickey and Janacek

With respect to dependent claims, these claims are patentable for the reasons given above regarding their respective independent claims. Moreover, the Examiner is simply picking and choosing selective teachings from the secondary teachings to somehow arrive at the present invention.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicant requests that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion. Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul F. Neils/
Paul F. Neils, Reg. No. 33,102
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 53844
Telephone: (703) 394-1381